SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	V	
VELENIA ANTIDOVA	:	
YELENA ANTIPOVA,	: :	
Plaintiff,	:	
-V-	:	21 Civ. 7453 (JPC) (BCM)
•	:	21 Civ. 7 133 (01 C) (BCIVI)
CAREMOUNT MEDICAL P.C. et al.,	:	ORDER ADOPTING
Defendants.	:	<u>REPORT AND</u> RECOMMENDATION
	: V	
	X	

JOHN P. CRONAN, United States District Judge:

IN HEED OF LEES DISEDISE SOLIDE

Pro se Plaintiff Yelena Antipova brought this medical malpractice action in September 2021. Dkt. 2. She died in January 2024. See Dkt. 107. By Order dated July 19, 2024, the Honorable Barbara C. Moses issued a Report and Recommendation on two motions to dismiss that were referred to her, recommending that the Court dismiss this case without prejudice either under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(a)(1) or alternatively under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Dkt. 119 ("R&R"); see Dkts. 114, 118 (referral orders).

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge" in a Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party submits a timely objection to any part of the magistrate judge's disposition, the district court will conduct a *de novo* review of the contested section. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). If no objections are made, the Court reviews the Report and Recommendation for clear error. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

Case 1:21-cv-07453-JPC-BCM Document 120 Filed 08/06/24 Page 2 of 2

The Report and Recommendation, citing both Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service

of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and warned that failure to timely file

such objections would result in waiver of any right to object. R&R at 8. No objections have been

filed and the time for making any objections has passed. The parties have therefore waived the

right to object to the Report and Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. See Frank v.

Johnson, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992); see also Caidor v. Onondaga Cnty., 517 F.3d 601 (2d

Cir. 2008).

Notwithstanding this waiver, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report and

Recommendation, and finds it to be well reasoned and its conclusions well founded. Accordingly,

the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety and dismisses this case pursuant

to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(a)(1) without prejudice. The Clerk of Court is thus

respectfully directed to close this case and enter judgment.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 6, 2024

New York, New York

United States District Judge

2